

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

RICKY MATLOCK, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	NO. 3:18-cv-00047
)	
ROUNDPOINT MORTGAGE)	JUDGE CAMPBELL
SERVICING CORPORATION, et al.,)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE NEWBERN
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave of Court to File Documents under Seal. (Doc. No. 87), Defendant LoanCare's Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. No. 95), and Defendant RoundPoint's Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. No. 99).

There is a strong presumption in favor of open records. *Signature Mgmt. Team, LLC v. Doe*, 876 F.3d 831, 836 (6th Cir. 2017) (citing *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. FTC*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1179 (6th Cir. 1983)). The Sixth Circuit has held that a party seeking to seal a document from public view must provide "compelling reasons" to seal the document and demonstrate that sealing is narrowly tailored to serve those reasons by analyzing "in detail, document by document, the propriety of secrecy, providing reasons and legal citations." *Shane Grp., Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan*, 825 F.3d 299, 305-06 (6th Cir. 2016); *see also* LR 5.03. This standard is higher than that required for protecting documents during discovery. *Beauchamp v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.*, 658 Fed. Appx. 202, 207 (6th Cir. 2016). In making the determination to seal a case, the Court balances the litigants' privacy interests against the public's right of access. *Rudd Equipment Co., Inc. v. John Deere Const. & Forestry Co.*, 834 F.3d 589, 594 (6th Cir. 2016).

According to Local Rule 5.03(c), it is the burden of the party who designated the materials as confidential to meet the requirements set out in Local Rule 7.01(a) and explain why the filing should remain under seal. Although Defendants acknowledge the relevant authority in their filings, their explanations with respect to the necessity of sealing are inadequate.

Accordingly, the pending motions for leave to file under seal (Doc. Nos. 87, 95, 99) are **DENIED** without prejudice to refiling pursuant to the standards set forth in *Shane Grp., Inc.*, 825 F.3d at 305-06 and in *Beauchamp*, 658 Fed. Appx. at 207 and in accordance with Local Rule 5.03. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to stay any unsealing of Doc. Nos. 87, 95, 99 for fourteen (14) days from the entry of this order.

It is so **ORDERED**.



WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE